Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003000090011-0 24 September 1968 Mr. Coffey: You asked me whether or not the DD/S would have any comments to submit prior to 17 September on Bob Wattles' paper of 27 August re: Request for Comments on Revised Fitness Report System. STAT STAT You will remember that I touched base with you on the 18th and then asked Messrs, to review my rough draft of a proposed DD/S Both officers were good enough to do this, position. although quite rightly requested that he not be quoted due to his office position. STAT STAT I also checked with as to whether or not Bob Wattles or he had arrived at any position. on the DD/P's proposal. The answer was negative. I am now passing the draft to you, and will be available at your convenience to discuss or revise it. **STAT**

STAT Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003000090011-0 **Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt**

STAT

19 September

STAT

I agree wholeheartedly with

comments.

Pefformance evaluation is the principal

task of any supervisor. The Fitness Report is the physical manifestation of this task. If the DD/P feels so strongly about this matter, the way to improve the situation would be to specify performance evaluation as a specific duty which will be included on the Fitness Reports of all supervisory personnel. This would reduce the problem to manageable proportions. The supervisor's me superior, who is also the reviewing authority, will have a tangible basis - the Fitness Reports prepared by the supervisor - on which to determine the supervisor's parformance execution of performance evaluation. The supervisor in turn will know that his own evaluation by his superior is contingent to some degree on the quality of his (the supervisor's) performance evaluations.

Nothing will substitute for continuous, close monitoring of performance evaluation throughout the command chain, but the foregoing does offer a specific and finite means for measuring this activity.

ILLEGIB

JK